

### EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Nicolas E. Seckel on March 29, 2010.

3. The application has been amended as follows:

**Please replace Claim 1 with the following claim language:**

1. (Currently amended): A security paper comprising:  
at least two plies of cellulose-type paper each formed of a respective fibrous mat,  
and  
at least in one area, at least one interlayer located at the junction of the two plies  
of cellulose-type paper,  
wherein the security paper includes an authentication element within a thickness  
of the security paper, and

wherein the interlayer includes at least one element giving the security paper a high double-fold resistance, as defined by the standard NF ISO 5626, said element being at least one of (i) a soluble element or an emulsifiable element, and (ii) an element in the form of particles, and

wherein the two plies and said element are intimately joined together in the interlayer, wherein (i) constituents of each of the two plies are interpenetrating with each other in the interlayer, and (ii) constituents of each of the two plies and constituents of the interlayer including said element are interpenetrating with one another in the interlayer,

so that the fibrous mats of the two plies of cellulose-type paper form a unitary fibrous mat throughout the area of the interlayer.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

4. Claims 1-13, 22 and 23 are directed to an allowable product. Pursuant to the procedures set forth in MPEP § 821.04(B), Claims 14-21, directed to the process of manufacturing an allowable product that was previously withdrawn from consideration as a result of a finding of lack of unity, are hereby rejoined and fully examined for patentability under 37 CFR 1.104.

5. Because all claims previously withdrawn from consideration under 37 CFR 1.142 have been rejoined, **the restriction requirement as set forth in the Office action mailed on May 20, 2009 is hereby withdrawn.** In view of the withdrawal of the restriction requirement as to the rejoined inventions, Applicants are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Once the restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 1-23 are allowed. Claims 14-21, which were previously withdrawn from consideration, have now been rejoined (see *supra*).

***Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance***

7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

8. Based upon the amendments made to the claims in the amendment filed on January 21, 2010, the U.S. Patent of Williams (3,880,706) is now the closest prior art to

that which is presently claimed. However, Williams fails to teach or suggest that in the areas where the interlayer of thermoplastic material is present that the two plies of paper and the interlayer are intimately joined, wherein the constituents of each of the two plies are interpenetrating with each other in the interlayer, and the constituents of each of the two plies and the interlayer are interpenetrating with one another so that the two plies of paper form a unitary fibrous mat throughout the area of the interlayer.

9. Additionally, based upon the amendments made to the claims in the amendment filed on January 21, 2010, the U.S. Patent Application Publication of Grob et al. (2006/0198987; hereinafter "Grob") is now a close art reference to that which is claimed in the instant application. However, it is noted that Grob is not applicable as prior art against the present claims in light of the effective filing date.

10. Claim 14 depends from claim 1 and is therefore allowable by the same reasoning.

11. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

*Conclusion*

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Joy whose telephone number is (571) 272-9056.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM EST.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Ruthkosky can be reached on (571) 272-1291. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

15. If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Ruthkosky/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/DJJ/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1794